

## **Response to Examiner Interview Summary**

In response to the Examiner's Interview Summary dated June 15, 2009, Applicant hereby submits a summary of the interview.

A personal interview took place for the subject application on May 19, 2009 with Examiners Sikri and Neurauter. There was no exhibit or demonstration of the invention provided during the course of this interview. The interview focused on an amendment to the claims submitted together with an Interview Agenda. More specifically, the Applicant's Attorney provided an oral explanation of the invention to the Examiner, and then identified the points of novelty as reflected in the claims. The prior art references of *Karim*, and *Lacy* were discussed, and specifically how the proposed amended limitations teach away from these prior art references applied by the Examiner. With respect to the prior art rejection, it was discussed how the prior art does not address separating a payload of a broadcasting packet from the header and rejoining the header and payload following transmission of the header. However, during the interview the Examiners focused on the "coding" aspect of the header, which was present in the original claims, and suggested either clarifying the coding that is being claimed, or rewriting the claims to further define the invention absent the "coding" aspect. It was suggested by the Examiners that Applicant present a Supplemental Amendment to the claim to further define their claim(s) to elaborate on the packet transmission process.

In compliance with MPEP §713.04, Applicant hereby requests entry of the Response to the Interview Summary.